

REMARKS

Presently pending in this application are claims 12-22. Claims 1-11 and 23-38 have been canceled.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by this Amendment.

Allowed Subject Matter

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his indication that the subject matter recited in claims 12-22 is allowable.

Allowed Subject Matter

Claim 23 has been objected to by the Examiner. As claim 23 has been canceled, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection is moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 31, 32, 33, and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) ("Section 102(b)") as being anticipated by U.S. patent No. 3,584,821 to Glebe ("Glebe").

Claims 1, 6 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) ("Section 103(a)") as being unpatentable over Glebe.

Claims 2-4, 36 and 37 have been rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glebe in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,829,731 to Dean ("Dean").

Claim 5 has been rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glebe in view of Dean and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,760,624 to Fish ("Fish").

Claims 7 and 8 have been rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glebe in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,811,720 to Quinnell et al. ("Quinnell").

Claims 9-11 have been rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glebe in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,276,087 to Singletary.

Claims 23, 28, and 34 have been rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glebe in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,391,889 to Stewart, Jr. ("Stewart").

Claims 24-26 have been rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glebe in view of Stewart and in further view of Dean.

Claim 27 has been rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glebe in view of Stewart and Dean and in further view of Fish.

Claims 29 and 30 have been rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glebe in view of Stewart and in further view of Quinnell.

Applicant has canceled rejected claims 1-11 and 23-38 without prejudice, and respectfully submits that the rejections of these claims is moot. The above amendments do not represent acquiescence in the Examiner's rejections and are made to expedite prosecution of the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue subject matter recited in the original claims in, for example, a continuation application.

Submitted concurrently herewith is a Petition for Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). No other fees are believed due with this response. Should any additional fees be due, please charge any such fees to Pennie & Edmonds LLP deposit account no. 16-1150.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 2, 2003

By: *David D. Lee* 51,929
for Brian M. Rothery
David D. Lee (Reg. No. 51,929)
For: Brian M. Rothery (Reg. No. 35,340)

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
1155 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 790-9090